



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/605,237

09/17/2003

Yu-Chuan Lin

9758-US-PA

3283

31561

7590

11/02/2005

JIANQ CHYUN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE

7 FLOOR-1, NO. 100

ROOSEVELT ROAD, SECTION 2

TAIPEI, 100

TAIWAN

EXAMINER

DUVERNE, JEAN F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/605,237

Applicant(s)

LIN ET AL.

Examiner

Jean F. Duverne

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 5 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reynolds (US 20020104246A1).

Reynolds' device discloses an interface apparatus with a rotational mechanism at 226 or see claim 26 for connecting with an interface port at 59, 60 in an electronic product, the interface apparatus comprising; a body at 64 comprising a memory module (69); a connector at 12 for connecting an interface port; and a rotational mechanism at for linking the body and the connector.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-6, 8, 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Reynolds (US 20020104246A1) in view of Stout et al (US006612874B1).

In regard to claim 2-3, Reynolds' device discloses the aforementioned limitations, but fails to explicitly disclose the memory module being volatile or the use of the USB interface. Stout's device discloses the use of volatile memory or the use of the USB interface. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the non-volatile memory module or the USB interface in order not to save the information when the power is turned off or to allow connection of different peripherals to the memory device using hubs in Reynolds' device.

In regard to claim 4, Reynolds' and Stout's devices disclose the aforementioned limitations, but fails to disclose the connector having IEEE 1394. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have connector design in accordance to IEEE 1394, since it has been held to be within the general skill of worker in the art to select known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have connector design in accordance to IEEE 1394 in order to meet the system specification and design in Reynolds' device.

In regard to claims 5-6, 8, 10-13, Reynolds' and Stout's devices disclose the aforementioned limitations, but fails to explicitly disclose the exact number of degrees of freedom of movement in the rotation which is an inherent feature. It would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a number of degrees of freedom of movement in the rotation, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. IN re Boesch, 617 F2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a specific number of degrees of freedom of movement in the rotation in order to meet the system design and requirement.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments filed with the amendment on 8/17/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The claims do not define structural structure features that distinguish over prior art: For example, Renold's device discloses a rotational mechanism for connecting with an interface port in an electronic product with a memory adapter having a memory structure (see fig. 23) to hold the displayed data with a control circuit at 270, and a connector for connecting with an interface port. Applicant argues that the module in Renold's device is different from from applicant's device. The examiner also agrees; nonetheless, Renold's device discloses the limitations as disclosed in the claims. The memory module is interpreted by the Examiner as a combination of memory devices associates other computer components or software for storing and displaying data. Therefore, the rejection is proper. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2839

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean F. Duverne whose telephone number is (571) 272-2091. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-7:30, Monday-Thursday.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild can be reached on (571) 272-2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2839

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JFD

10/24/2005



Jean-François Duverne
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2839